

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference P-11000 PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/SE2005/000472	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 30 March 2005 (30.03.2005)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 31 March 2004 (31.03.2004)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant AKTIEBOLAGET ELECTROLUX			

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

Date of issuance of this report 04 October 2006 (04.10.2006)
--

Authorized officer

Philippe Becamel

e-mail: pt12@wipo.int

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

REC'D 04 JUL 2005

WIPO

PCT

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

AB Electrolux
Group Entellectual Property
433 81 Jonsered
Sverige

PCT

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

29 -06- 2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference
P-11000 PCT

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/SE2005/000472

International filing date (day/month/year)
30.03.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
31.03.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
B28D 1/14 // B23B 45/02

Applicant
Aktiebolaget Electrolux et al

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

Box No. I Basis of the opinion
 Box No. II Priority
 Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
 Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 Box No. VI Certain documents cited
 Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
 Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/SE

Patent- och registreringsverket

Box 5055

S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88

Authorized officer

Fredrik Strand / JA A

Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/SE2005/000472

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

in written format
 in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/SE2005/000472

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	2-11	YES
	Claims	1	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-11	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-11	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The following documents were cited as particularly relevant:

D1: JP 2001129708 A
 D2: JP 8252819 A
 D3: JP 8025117 A

The invention relates to a core-drilling device where the feeding unit is driven by an electric motor with a control unit. The primary object of the invention is to solve the problem with the initial phase of the drilling operation where the drill easily slides sideways.

Document D1 represents closest background art.

Claim 1

Document D1 reveals a drilling machine (WPI abstract, fig. 2) for core-drilling. The drilling machine comprises a stand (D), a feeding housing (A) and an electric motor (C) for feeding the feeding housing. A control unit with controls (fig. 1, pos 12 and 13) is electrically connected to the feeding unit.

The invention differs from the document in that the feed control is operated manually. However, it is considered to be a trivial solution to arrange the feed control to be operated manually instead of automatically.

Therefore, the claim lacks novelty.

For a further example, see documents D2 and D3 where drilling machines for core-drilling with feeding units are revealed.

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/SE2005/000472

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: Box V

Claims 2-11

According to what is revealed in document D1, together with general knowledge in the field, the solutions according to claims 2-11 seems only to be obvious for a person skilled in the art.

Consequently, the claims lack inventive step.

According to the arguments stated above, the invention according to claim 1 lacks novelty but the invention according to claims 2-11 is novel. Claims 1-11 are not considered to involve an inventive step. The invention according to claims 1-11 is considered to be industrially applicable.